

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_128379
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing breadfruit processing for nutritional, phytochemical and antioxidant properties: enhancing food security in Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Optimizing breadfruit processing for nutritional, phytochemical, and antioxidant characteristics is critical for improving Nigeria's food security situation. Breadfruit is high in essential nutrients, and refining processing procedures can improve bioavailability, addressing nutritional issues. Furthermore, optimizing processing procedures can increase the release of important phytochemicals and antioxidants, resulting in improved health outcomes and disease prevention. For the scientific community, this strategy provides a long-term answer to improve food security while also enhancing breadfruit's economic potential in Nigeria.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	Thanks
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a clear objective, solid background, and well-defined methodology. The methods for analyzing nutritional content, phytochemicals, and antioxidants in breadfruit are appropriate and standard. However, there are a few areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Clarity: Some analytical methods, especially for vitamins (e.g., Vitamin B7) and antioxidants, could benefit from more detail.Methodology: Specific protocols for vitamin analysis and mineral content could be referenced for transparency.Statistical Analysis: Details on assumptions of ANOVA (e.g., normality) should be included for robustness.Terminology: Some phrasing could be clearer for better readability. <p>In summary, the manuscript is scientifically correct but could benefit from more detail and precision in certain sections.</p>	<p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revision made</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	Thanks
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, The language and English quality of the article is generally clear and understandable	
Optional/General comments	NO NO, Based on the provided manuscript, there are no explicit ethical issues that are apparent.	Ok revised

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	